

JAN 30 2008

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application: Vaishya, Manish  
Serial No.: 10/606,981  
Filed: 06/26/2003  
Group Art Unit: 2615  
Examiner: Faulk, Devona E  
For: CALIBRATION SYSTEM FOR AN ACTIVE NOISE CONTROL  
SYSTEM

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Non-Final Office Action mailed on October 30, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

**The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112  
should be withdrawn**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The Examiner suggests that the claim language "repeatedly calibrating the system over time" is not disclosed in the specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Paragraph 20 on page 5 includes the statement that an example is configured to calibrate the system "often." That is entirely consistent with repeatedly calibrating the system over time. Claims 21 and 22 are clearly supported by the description. The rejection should be withdrawn.